

**Remarks:**

Examiner has provided a new office action withdrawing his earlier indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4, 5, and 7. Claims 1-8 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), again based on the teachings of Haran (Comverse Systems, cited earlier by Examiner). Further, Examiner has objected to claim 9 because it depends on a rejected claim, but has indicated that claim 9 is otherwise allowable as "nothing in the prior art teaches or fairly suggests performing arbitration between various services, in combination with the other limitations listed in the claim."

With this paper, independent claims 1 and 8 are amended to more clearly point out Applicant's invention, and now include arbitration. Claim 8 is further amended to clarify matters of form. Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 8 are now ready for allowance. Applicant further believes that claims 2, 3, and 7, which depend on claim 1, are therefore also ready for allowance in view of the amendment of claim 1.

Regarding the other dependent claims: Claim 4 is amended to more clearly point out an aspect of Applicant's invention pertaining to the basis for routing message signals, and to clarify matters of form. Claim 5 is cancelled. Claim 6, which depends on claim 1, is amended to clarify matters of form. Claim 9 is amended to delete the step of performing arbitration, which step has been written into claim 8 by this paper.

Applicant believes that claims 1-9 are now ready for allowance, and respectfully asks Examiner to allow these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

By: David R. Irvin

David R. Irvin

Reg. No. 42,682